Attachment 3

Text of MTC Resolution No. 3564

Date: June 25, 2003
W.I.: 1212
Referred by: POC

Re: Adoption of corridor objectives and performance measurement criteria for the 2005 Regional Transportation Plan

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO. 3564

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the regional transportation planning agency for the San Francisco Bay Area pursuant to Government Code Sections 66500 et seq.; and

WHEREAS, Section 66535 requires MTC to adopt corridor goals and measurable corridor objectives and performance measurement criteria to evaluate all new projects and programs in the Transportation 2030 (2004 Regional Transportation Plan) at the project and corridor level; and

WHEREAS, the existing Regional Transportation Plan Goals serve as overarching goals for all the RTP corridors; and

WHEREAS, MTC staff has developed a framework of universal corridor objectives and corresponding performance measurement criteria based on discussions with a committee composed of partners, MTC Advisory Council members and other stakeholders; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, MTC adopts the corridor objectives as set forth in Attachment A, the performance measurement criteria as set forth in Attachment B, and the project evaluation screening criteria set forth in Attachment C, and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Commission will conduct a policy review of candidate projects upon completion of the performance analysis for consistency with MTC-ABAG Smart Growth objectives.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Steve Kinsey, Chair

The above resolution was entered into by the
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
at a regular meeting of the Commission held in
Oakland, California, on June 25, 2003.

Date: June 25, 2003
W.I.: 1212
Referred by: POC

Attachment A
Resolution No. 3564
Page 1 of 1

Corridor Objectives Framework for Project and Corridor Performance Evaluation for the Transportation 2030

Maintain the existing system
- Reduce maintenance and rehabilitation shortfalls

Improve System Safety
- Minimize injuries and loss of life in event of seismic failure or collisions/other safety incidents

Accommodate growth in person and freight travel while preserving or improving travel time
- Operate the system more efficiently
- Operate the system more reliably
- Increase capacity and reduce bottlenecks through strategic expansion

Increase convenience for persons and freight
- Improve system connectivity by adding new links to the transportation network, adding new points of connection or improving existing points of connection
- Improve access to the regional transportation system
- Operate the system with greater attention to customer service (Be more customer-oriented)

Maximize external benefits and minimize disbenefits
- Protect the environment/public health
- Support community vitality through transportation improvements that improve mobility and accessibility within communities
- Address transportation needs of region's most disadvantaged households
- Support the MTC-ABAG Smart Growth objectives.

Date: June 25, 2003
W.I.: 1212
Referred by: POC

Attachment B
Resolution No. 3564
Page 1 of 1

Performance Measurement Criteria for the Transportation 2030

MEASURES FOR PROJECT NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Objective Category/ Aspect Measured	**Performance Criteria/** ***Measurement***
Improve safety	
• Seismic safety	Number of persons at risk in event of failure in 2025 *Number of daily facility users (persons)*
	Is project on Caltrans lifeline system? (state highways only)
• Collisions (all modes) and transit security	Recent incident history *Average number of incidents or incident rate over past three years**
Maintain the System	
• Roadway maintenance	Future wear and tear on roads *Total vehicle miles traveled and truck vehicle miles traveled in 2025*
• Transit maintenance	Future wear and tear on transit system *Passenger miles per vehicle plus vehicle miles per vehicle in 2025*
Accommodate growth in person and freight travel from now until 2025 and preserve or improve travel time	
• Make existing capacity more reliable	Roadways – Crowding in 2025 *Peak period volume to capacity ratio*
	Transit – On-time performance *Future on-time performance rate based on record over past three years and 2025 operating conditions (deterioration in bus speeds)*
• Make more efficient use of existing capacity • Construct/create new capacity	Roadways – Crowding in 2025 *Peak period volume to capacity ratio (report separately for HOV lanes and major truck routes)*
	Transit – Ridership and capacity in 2025 *Peak period transit passengers and seats*

* Data to be provided by project proposer

June 25, 2003

Attachment B
MTC Resolution No. 3564
Page 10 of 3

Objective Category/ Aspect Measured	**Performance Criteria/ *Measurement***
Increase user convenience	
• Improve connectivity	New connections – Qualitative assessment of gap or connectivity in local or regional plan. If not in a plan, describe deficiency.*
	Improved connection points (transit transfer points, highway-to-highway interchanges/intersections)
	Transit – levels of connecting services in 2025
	Rate of connecting services (e.g. buses/hour and trains/hour)
	Roadways – level of activity at connections in 2025
	Number of vehicles using connection
• Improve access for passengers to regional transportation network	Transit – Transit station boardings in 2025
	Daily boardings at major transit terminals
	Roadways – Population and job growth from today to 2025 in areas adjacent to highways
• Improve access from ports and airports to the regional transportation network	Projected growth in cargo and air passengers from today to 2025*
	Increase in port cargo volume, air freight tonnage and air passengers
• Customer service improvements	Deficiencies identified through formal evaluation process*
External Benefits	
• Air Quality	Daily emissions in corridor in 2025 (ozone and particulate matter)
	Is project a state or federal TCM?
• Noise Reduction	Traffic volume and speed in 2025
• Equity	Is project intended to serve an identified community of concern from RTP equity analysis?*
	Is project an identified Lifeline transit route?*
	Is project intended to revitalize an urban area?*
	Is project from a community-based transportation plan?*
• Community Vitality	Does project enable community residents to use a range of modes (bicycle, walk, transit) to access daily activities within the community*
	Does project support a community's development and/or redevelopment activities?*
	Does project implement MTC-ABAG Smart Growth objectives?

* Data to be provided by project proposer

June 25, 2003

Attachment B
MTC Resolution No. 3564
Page 11 of 3

MEASURES FOR CORRIDOR BENEFITS ANALYSIS

Corridor Benefit	**Performance Criteria** ***Measurement***
Mobility	User benefit *Value of travel time savings plus out-of-pocket cost savings for the alternative compared to the 2001 RTP*
Accessibility	Change in average travel time *All trips within corridor by mode AM and midday for each alternative compared to the 2001 RTP*
Emissions/Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)	Change in emissions (ozone and particulate matter) and VMT *Calculate change in VMT for each alternative compared to the 2001 RTP. Use EMFAC2002 to calculate change in daily emission levels from vehicle trips and VMT for each alternative compared to the 2001 RTP*

* Data to be provided by project proposer

Date: June 25, 2003
W.I.: 1212
Referred by: POC

Attachment C
Resolution No. 3564
Page 1 of 1

Project Evaluation Screening Criteria

- Investment is not defined sufficiently to generate sketch level data for evaluation. (Minimum requirements will be defined.)
- Investment is proposed to replace an existing Track 1 project, unless sponsor wishes to withdraw project from Track 1.
- Investment was studied and rejected in a recently completed corridor/major investment study.
- The cost of the investment is not reasonable in proportion to estimated new county Track 1 funds (i.e. a single project should not require more than 40% of estimated Track 1 funds; threshold may be higher in small counties with small amounts of new Track 1 funding.)
- There is not a reasonable guarantee of operating funds.
- Investment has a fatal environmental flaw.
- Investment requires a change in law or regulations to be funded or implemented, unless there is a reasonable expectation that such a change may be enacted.
- Proposal is a broad policy (e.g. value pricing, smart growth) rather than a project.